I am a young and concerned citizen. I turn 18 just in time to vote in the next election and I am apprehensive for the coming attempt at network regulation.

Network Neutrality is a hard issue to discuss because it involves technology, something that moves quickly. I consider myself to be tech savvy, and I still have trouble keeping up with everything there is out there. I find that it would be difficult for law makers, people who have not necessarily made technology their life's work, to make such pivotal decisions.

This is why I would like to leave the networks to the free market, where professionals and consumers decide how the internet will shape itself and transform. The free market, like technology is agile and can adapt to changes swiftly. In the free market, if the internet service providers were doing something to displease their customers, the customers would be driven away and seek a new provider. If there is a demand, some one will meet it; if people demand their internet work a certain way, companies will cater to their customers or perish.

The supporters of Net Neutrality aim to make their totalitarianism sound like fairness for all. The supporters use the word "Neutral" to fool many into assuming Net Neutrality is benevolent.

A look in Merriam-Webster and you will find that similar words to "Neutral" are "autonomous, independent, and sovereign". Antonyms are defined as "biased, partial, partisan, prejudiced, and unfair." Bringing Net Neutrality into law will yield anything but "autonomous, independent, and sovereign," laws that control the internet will take away the sovereignty of the internet. The internet will no longer the free place they envision. The internet will be impeded by law and will no longer be the place for invention and creativity.

There is a common misconception that the internet is a public resource. This is a fallacy that is commonly perpetuated. The internet service providers have done such an excellent job at marketing their product that people now believe it is a public resource due to the fact of its ready availability. The reality of the situation is that the cables that the internet is connected with are owned and maintained by private companies which spend their own money to maintain and improve the connections. It is not the governments place to decide how these companies send data in their own cables.

Many seem to believe that it is the United States government's job to regulate the internet. These people feel threatened by the fact that one packet (a piece of digital information) could be prioritized over another.

In reality what some ISP's propose is similar sending mail; you can send mail to someone and it will get there in a few days, or you can spend a little more money and have the package reach its destination sooner. The case is the same with the internet, the only differences are instead of

packages, we are sending packets, and instead of a difference in days to delivery we are talking about a difference in milliseconds.

The internet is an important place for commerce and market growth. The reason the internet is so successful is because the government has left it alone to let it develop and grow. There will be little harm from the changes the internet service providers wish to institute. At most, some teenager in his basement will be have to wait a little longer for his illegal downloads to complete.

I have heard many who argue for Net Neutrality use the founding fathers in a way that truly proves they do not understand how the United States was founded. Trust the founding fathers, they were right when they said the free market should be left to decide.